

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 9 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 4 and 7 being independent claims. Based on the foregoing amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the personal interview conducted on October 26, 2004. During the interview, independent claims 1, 4, 7 and 10 were discussed with respect to the applied references. The Examiner agreed that independent claim 1 would be allowable if amended to include the subject matter of claim 2 and also recite that the fabric shield is loose (i.e., not taut) when the seat is in the collapsed configuration. Applicants agreed to amend claim 4 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 6. Applicants further agreed to amend claim 7 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 8. Applicants agreed to cancel claims 10 and 11 without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of those claims in subsequent applications.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended claim 9 to more clearly

define the scope of the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,464,594 to Canna ("the Canna patent"). As discussed during the Examiner Interview, Applicants have amended claim 1 to overcome the rejection based on the Canna patent. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable. Based at least on its dependence upon independent claim 1, dependent claim 3 is also allowable. The rejection with respect to claim 2 is obviated by the cancellation of claim 2.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,256,016 to Berlin ("the Berlin patent"). Independent claim 4 has been amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 6, which was indicated as allowable. Accordingly, independent claim 4 is allowable over the Berlin patent. Based at least on its dependence upon independent claim 4, dependent claim 5 is also allowable.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,564,987 to Ayrolles ("the Ayrolles patent"). Independent claim 7 has been amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 8, which was indicated as allowable. Accordingly, independent claim 7 is allowable over the Ayrolles patent. Based at least on its dependence upon independent claim 7, dependent claim 9 is also allowable.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,319,138 to Fair et al. ("the Fair patent"). Applicants have canceled claim 10, thereby obviating the rejection of claim 10.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Fair patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,471,597 to Flannery et al. ("the Flannery patent"). Applicants have canceled claim 11, thereby obviating the rejection of claim 11.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in the application.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that further personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COOLEY GODWARD LLP



By:

Erik B. Milch
Reg. No. 42,887

Date: November 5, 2004

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston Town Center
Reston, Virginia 20190-5656
(703) 456-8000 – Phone
(703) 456-8100 - Facsimile